UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Realistic Moral Choice - *Paul C. Rodgers, Jr.*

Socialism in the United States Today - - - - - - - - - - *John H. Hershey*

Marital Vows - - - - - - *George E. O'Dell*

Is Marriage a Refuge for Women? - *Ethel S. Beer*

Lincoln Looks Away - - *Harold P. Marley*

What Faith Should Mean to You - - - - - - - - - - - - *Edward Podolsky*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXLII No. 3

Chicago, September-October, 1956

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

Realistic Moral Choice

PAUL C. RODGERS, JR.

It is very hard to get quick advice from a Unitarian —if your problem is a moral problem.

The reason for this is that a Unitarian's moral know-how, what there is of it, is not canned. He cannot just squeeze it out, like salve from a tube. He is leary of absolutes and suspicious of pat answers. He does not trust the decision he makes today until tomorrow puts it to proof; he does not believe that the answer to yesterday's question is necessarily the answer to the same question today. So if you ask his advice on a moral problem, you are asking your Unitarian to think, and thinking takes time. You will not get a quick answer.

But you must not get the idea that Unitarians are not interested in moral problems, as other men are. Unitarians are equipped with a full complement of human weaknesses, and they are subject to the same impulses and perplexities that afflict mankind at large. They know what it is to fail; and some of them, no doubt, commit errors so serious as to warrant the old-fashioned name of sin. And they, too, hunger after righteousness—though they may not call it exactly by that name.

On the other hand, it should be noted that Unitarians, like other men, invariably do what they think it is right to do. Like other men, they always believe, at the moment they act, that their action, whatever it may be, is justifiable.

Thus the special problem the Unitarian faces is not the problem of deciding whether or not to do what is right, but the problem of determining what it is right to do.

How, then, are we to go about determining this thing which it is "right" to do? How, as a matter of present-day fact, *do* we go about it?

It seems to me that though we often are quite knowledgeable on the subject of what is "wrong," we very rarely qualify as experts on rightness or goodness. We seem to assume that what is good and right cannot be adequately known until *after* it has been realized. Our world is so preponderantly a world of failure and disillusionment, of gratuitous tragedy and stubborn evil, that we classify the notion of preponderant good or preponderant virtue as a figment of the utopian imagination. Instead of insisting upon attempting to do "what is right," we content ourselves with doing "what is not known to be wrong."

Thus we seek to advance while facing backwards. Our search for the good life is not a pilgrimage to some Promised Land; it is a timid reconnoitering in *terra incognita.* We are forever attempting to attain serenity by making war upon the anarchist within us; to establish a credit rating by paying off petty debts; to become honest simply by never telling a lie with our lips; to stumble upon virtue by sidestepping sin. "To achieve good," we say, "avoid the known bad."

This may be a crude, primitive, and often unsatisfactory method, but at least it *is* a method, the only method we seem to have, now that angels no longer walk the earth and speak to men.

Often this method works, too. It all depends upon what sort of success we have in discriminating realistically among our alternatives.

To achieve the good, we must first be able to choose it. And since good often cannot be identified, it often cannot be chosen. The art of discrimination, as it is practised among us, is the art of identifying what is bad as realistically as possible, and of separating this bad from that which is not bad—or which *perhaps* is not bad.

Long ago, under the conditions of primitive life, the whole world of possible choice could be dichotomized quite readily. That is, the whole of it could be neatly divided into two parts, two categories of choices. To secure good weather and good hunting, one avoided antagonizing the rain god and the god of the chase. To secure peace, one destroyed one's enemy. To secure a meal, one set aside the inedible and munched on the residue. To secure a wife, one sought out an unattached adult who was not a man. Morality was always feasible and often easy.

Such primitive dichotomies continue to divide the world, for many simple-minded persons. If one indulges in any of the Seven Deadly Sins, one cannot go to Heaven. If one does *not* philander or commit adultery, one *is* a faithful spouse. If one does *not* refuse to repeat the words of the Oath of Allegiance, one passes muster as a patriotic citizen. If one is *not* a Republican, then one *is* a Democrat.

For a Unitarian, as for any thoughtful man, such categories are grossly inadequate. For a Unitarian there is a long, delicately graded scale of values stretching between the poles of "very good" and "very bad." Somewhere along that scale there is a sort of grey, neutral area where the markings become rather indistinct. And just about the place where "just on the good side" turns into "just on the bad side," the markings suddenly become wholly illegible. It is in this indistinct, unanalyzed area that the Unitarian makes his mistakes and thus commits his sins. His errors are errors in discrimination; his sins are neither more nor less than failures—in perception. His faults lie not in his stars but in his dichotomies.

To succeed in choosing what is good, more often than he does, the Unitarian must make himself a connoisseur of the undesirable. He must test and retest his dichotomies, rejecting false and obsolete ones (that now are too loose to serve), updating the obsolescent by tightening their bite, restoring the ones that have been unwisely forgotten, and establishing such new ones as may disclose themselves to him. His knowledge of valid dichotomies comprises the form and the substance of his wisdom. Without such wisdom, whatever other knowledge he may have is useless, because it is inert.

Thus the Unitarian who desires wisdom may seek to attain it, for instance, by sharpening the dull edge of the age-old opposition between Justice and Inequity. There are far too many miscarriages of Justice, he decides; people are finding it far too difficult to avoid doing what is not just. Equity (i.e., Justice) sometimes seems to be as distant as an optimist's pipe dream.

The Unitarian therefore intently observes Inequity, the lack to Justice. What is it about Inequity which makes it so difficult to avoid?

He soon makes the discovery that Inequity has a curiously subtle and ambiguous nature; that it is not coextensive with Injustice; that Injustice is simply "unmerited punishment," whereas Inequity embraces

not only Injustice but also *Mercy,* "unmerited reward." He realizes that when men try to do Justice, and fail, and wish to try again, that they must know in which direction they have erred, whether by overgenerosity or by denial of what is justly due.

He also recognizes that part of men's difficulty lies in the fact that their definition of Justice is forever changing. He sees clearly that at a time like the present, when the idea of Justice is undergoing revision in the direction of Mercy—that is, when what today is Mercy is in the course of becoming what tomorrow will know as Justice—that it is vital that Justice be frankly spoken of as Justice, and Mercy as Mercy. So when he seeks Mercy for himself in the courts of men, the Unitarian does not falsify it with the name of Justice; and when he looks to Heaven, he does not confuse Old Testament Justice with New Testament Mercy. To him, the concept of Mercy is far too precious to abandon, but so is the concept of Justice; and he knows he cannot have either, if he is not willing to recognize both.

Again, the wise Unitarian may discover value in old perceptions now forgotten. In the concept of Wealth, for example. We now think of Wealth in terms of possessions. Wealth is money, or the things we have given money to get. When we refer metaphorically to our youth or character or good reputation or to our children, as Wealth, we are thinking of possessions. The opposite of such Wealth, of course, is lack of possessions, Poverty. Admittedly, this is a valid and valuable pair of alternatives!

Far more valuable, however, is the dichotomy which reestablishes the now obsolete use of the word "wealth" in the sense of "well-being," "happiness," "weal" (as in the phrase, "the public weal"). Wealth here is not one's physical possessions, but, rather, the good which one is able to derive from these possessions—manifestly a different idea altogether. This second kind of Wealth is intangible. It cannot be computed. It often cannot be controlled. Its opposite is not "lack of possessions." Its opposite originates in the *possession* of possessions from which we do *not* derive good, possessions that merely encumber us or which actually do us harm. The word "Illth," a term coined by John Ruskin, can serve as a label for this rather nebulous idea. Wealth and its opposite, Illth, are what we derive from our possessions. Wealth is the bread of life; Illth is a stone.

The surest sign of wisdom in a Unitarian is his ability to reveal fresh dichotomies. I can only suggest what one of these might be.

It seems to me that the traditional opposition of Love and Hate is so restricted in its application that it is virtually useless. To avoid Hate is not necessarily to achieve Love, or at least not normally. Only now and then, in very close, personal relationships, do Love and Hate divide the total field of possibility—in some marital relationships, for instance, or in the relationship of some parents with their children. Hell hath no fury, as some lovers know, like Love to Anger turned. And some children can tell you that after every storm there comes a flawless dawn. But this is not the experience of all children or all lovers. For many persons, young and old, there are emotions much less passionate than Hate and much less benign than Love.

Yet if Hate is not the opposite of Love, what *is?* What is it that we have to choose *not* to do in order to arrive at Love?

I am not speaking of romantic love, of course. I am concerned with the type of love that the Bible calls "charity" and which we call "good will," "friendliness," or "brotherly affection," or which, as it broadens and deepens in family life, we know as "parental love" and "filial devotion" and the bond between husband and wife, a bond for which we have no special name.

The opposite of this love, I am convinced, is not Hate—but *Fear.*

When we fail to love, it is always because we fear. When we cast off Fear, we always invoke Love. In a situation where Love is possible, Fear is possible too; and vice versa—and where either Love or Fear is possible, there is no third possibility. Love and Fear control the field.

Fear has a thousand forms; it flaunts a thousand disguises. It bewilders us with its nomenclature. And when we try to study it, Fear itself obstructs our analysis, for Fear is too disreputable to think about.

There are times, of course, when Fear announces its presence quite candidly. These are the times when not to fear would be fatal and when it would be disastrous to love, and when we feel no shame in feeling Fear and no regret in denying Love. But there are not many of these times. Usually Fear insinuates itself so subtly that we do not even know we are afraid; and before we can find Fear out and determine whether or not we *ought* to be afraid, Fear ceases to be Fear and becomes something else.

Because of fear of *possible* criticism, we turn ourselves into critics. Because of fear of *possible* ridicule, we learn the use of sarcasm. Because of fear of *possible* disillusionment, we retreat into cynicism.

Our fear of *possible* attack sends us out on the offensive. Our fear of *possible* injustice causes us to withhold mercy. Our fear of *possible* loss of love persuades us that love is not wealth, but illth. We carp and sneer and doubt and attack and deny mercy and denigrate affection, because we fear. In short, we reject Love because we feel unsafe.

Rather than be charitable, we become what we call "realistic." The realist, we say, is the man who cannot be surprised. He is never taken in, or caught napping, or disillusioned, or jilted. He prides himself upon facing what he calls facts; and by anticipating all conceivable disasters, he maintains a peculiar, rather pale, emotional solvency.

But this realist is a perpetually frightened man, who can not risk Love; and such realism as he exhibits is really not very realistic. Its basis, of course, is Fear, uncriticized Fear which may or may not be valid. He lacks the insight to discriminate between impulses arising from fear of *possible* disaster and impulses arising from fear of disaster that is *probable.* And because life places no limit upon possible disaster, there can be no limit to the obstacles which cut this so-called realist off from Love.

All of us occasionally indulge in such false realism, and all of us suffer occasional loss of the ability to love. Even in our private lives we cannot fear with impunity. When children become truculent or listless, when parents cease to feel their parental obligations, when wives grow cold and husbands restless, when houses are not homes and homes are not large enough for all they must contain—then Fear has had its day.

And all this is true, even for the Unitarian!

But if his dichotomies are realistic, the Unitarian has wisdom. His wisdom distinguishes Justice from both Injustice and Mercy; it separates his Wealth from his Illth; and it shows him that when he has cast forth Fear from his house, Love will already have entered in.

Socialism in the United States Today

JOHN H. HERSHEY

What are the principles and programs of Socialists in the United States today? The following survey attempts to answer this question objectively in dealing with six socialist political parties, three non-party leagues, and four journals functioning at the present time. The material presented is based on their own publications, declarations of principles, and spokesmen. Each of the three categories noted above is arranged alphabetically, beginning with the political parties.

The Communist Party, U. S. A. First let us consider what it is against before taking up its positive program, as elaborated in two pamphlets, *The American Way to Jobs, Peace, and Democracy* (1954), and *The Farm Crisis* (1955). It is against "the Wall Street-dominated Eisenhower Administration," the "ugly menace of McCarthyism." the "wiretapping and FBI snooping," "congressional witch-hunt committees," racism, anti-Semitism. As to foreign affairs, the party opposes the United States "meddling" in the internal affairs of other countries, and the rearmament of Western Germany.

The various proposals of the party apropos of farmers and laborers include the guarantee of at least 100 per cent parity on all farm commodities, the establishment of federal minimum standards of wages, health, housing, transportation, and working conditions for agricultural workers, a substantial increase in unemployment and old-age benefits, and a federal health program. As to global problems, the party favors world disarmament, a ban on the use of atomic weapons, and peaceful coexistence between the United States and Russia.

What of the party's attitude toward the Democratic and Republican Parties? In 1955 it said:

> Workers and farmers need to get together to make the weight of their organizations felt by the two major parties in the shaping of programs and selection of candidates for the 1956 campaign. While both parties are Wall Street-dominated, the Democratic Party, which draws its votes chiefly from the working class and the Negro people, is forced to be more responsive to such pressure than the Republican Party. Nationally, a coalition of progressive voters can have its greatest effect with the Democratic Party. . . .

The Communist Party, U. S. A. says, however, that it looks ahead to the forming of a farmer-labor party representing the "militant advance of the great majority."

But the ultimate solution to social problems, the party holds, is Socialism based on Marxist-Leninist principles. It means that industries will be the property of the whole people, and that their product will go to the whole people. The method of bringing Socialism about is to be peaceful.

In its approach to world Communism, the party says: "The rise of the Soviet Union, its tremendous industrial and cultural advance, the victory of the Chinese people and the peoples of Eastern Europe, prove that Socialism is here to stay and is indestructible."

The Proletarian Party of America. Founded in 1920, its headquarters is in Chicago, and its publication is the monthly *Proletarian News,* called "a journal for the working class." The party professes the fundamental principles of Marxian Communism.

Capitalism, the party says, makes for depressions and wars. Profit, interest, and rent are "the holy trinity of the prophets" of the capitalistic system. The political interests of the capitalistic nations follow their economic interests rather than the contrary. Although it is the workers who produce the wealth, its value is vastly in excess of the value of their wages; hence the workers are exploited. Thus two sharp classes arise: the rich exploiters and the exploited workers. Is there a way out by making reforms within the present system? The party says "no." The only way out is by bringing about the classless society of communism.

How is this goal to be achieved? The party asserts that it is by "revolutionary action." By this is meant that the majority of class-conscious workers must organize into a political party of their own for independent political action in order to take control of the government. This is a transition stage, enabling the workers' party to socialize industry. Finally, the state as the "public power of coercion" will end, and the classless administration of things will emerge.

This socialization of industry, the party maintains, is not the same as the nationalization of industry by a state. In the former, the old employer-employe relationship does not exist; but in the latter, the workers remain wage-earners with the state as employer.

With reference to Russia, the party says that it is "a new type of state—a Socialist Soviet State—the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the political rule of the workers."

In its global outlook the party asserts that "only when the world becomes completely socialized will there be real security, real peace, and prosperity. For then the cause of war, exploitation, and poverty—in short, Capitalism—will have been abolished."

Socialist Labor Party. The party, founded as long ago as 1890, has its headquarters in New York City and locals in many states. It has nominated presidential candidates since 1892, has had tickets in some states, and at its national convention in May, 1956, selected its presidential candidate. The party publishes the *Weekly People* newspaper.

The party opposes Capitalism, patching or reforming the present system, bureaucracy, the "political state with its horde of politicians," territorial representation, and ownership and control of industry by the political state. This last means merely a change of masters from individual Capitalists to government. Apropos of the 1955 merger of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., the party says: "For there is certainly nothing for the Capitalists to fear in this united movement of American labor fakers." On the international scene, it is against the Russian government which is a "despotic, brutal State," Titoism, Fascism, and any other form of totalitarianism.

The party asserts that it is for peaceful and orderly change from Capitalism to Socialism by means of the ballot.

The Socialism of Marx, Engels, and also of Daniel DeLeon (1852-1914) is espoused by the party. The following quotation gives its meaning of Socialism:

> First of all, industry under Socialism will be *socially* owned—not privately owned, or State-owned (for there will be no State), but *socially* owned. This means that directors and directed will be *on the same side,* working together for mutually beneficial ends.
>
> Secondly, social production will be under the control of the Socialist Industrial Union, with actual management in the hands of foremen, superintendents, management committees, and higher administrative councils elected by the rank and file and removable at will by the rank and file. Thus, all power is in the only safe place for power to be. And this is an additional guarantee that authority will be exercised rationally and responsibly.

The Socialist Labor Party declares that it is "the only genuine Socialist organization in the United States."

Socialist Party, U. S. A. This party, with headquarters in New York City, was founded in 1900. In June, 1956, it nominated Darlington Hoopes and Samuel H. Friedman for President and Vice-President respectively. Pamphlets and the monthly *Socialist Call* are published by the party.

Some of the things to which the party is opposed are: "Witch-hunts against progressive thought," the Smith Act, Capitalism, extreme militarization of the Western democracies, isolationism, economic nationalism, imperialism. With regard to Russia, the party says that it is not a land of democratic Socialism, but a dictatorship and aggressively imperialistic.

Particular measures for which the party stands include: Strengthening of family farms through cooperative credit purchasing and marketing, aided by government financing; but great corporation farms with absentee ownership will be given back to the working farmers. The party is also for public housing, expansion of public health services, civil liberties, racial equality. Internationally, it is for eventual free trade, the development of the United Nations into a Federal World Government, economic interdependence and mutuality among the free peoples of the world, and a world-wide cooperative commonwealth of free men.

With reference to the establishment of democratic Socialism in the United States, the party says:

> Socialism will democratize the economic life of the nation by the joint representation of workers, the working management, and the consuming public, in the operation of socialized enterprises; by the guarantee of popular control of enterprises through the maximum decentralization economically feasible and the use of various types of organization, particularly the public corporation and the voluntary cooperative, and by the preservation of the freedom of labor organization and of consumer choice.

What is to be socially owned and democratically managed, according to the party, are especially the basic industries, public utilities, banking, credit institutions, and natural resources.

The party answers the question as to whether compensation would be given to owners of industries taken over by a socialist government by saying: "Once Socialists have been given the 'go-ahead' signal by the votes of the people, a Socialist Congress will buy, at a fair value, the factories and mills and mines."

The Socialist Workers Party. This party in New York City was founded by members of the Communist Party, U. S. A., who had left that party in 1928 and later started their new party. Members have run for such offices as United States Senator from New York and as President and Vice-President of the United States.

The party is not only opposed to Capitalism as it is, but also to reforming it. Capitalists cannot be persuaded to act for the good of the people. The system cannot be reformed; even if it could be, it is not worth reforming. Depressions and imperialist wars are basic phases of the cycle of Capitalism. But it does provide the basis for something new—the working class and modern machine industry.

"Stalinism" is likewise opposed by the party because it commits crimes against the labor movement and sets up a "police regime that is smoothing the road for the return of Capitalism." But Leon Trotsky, along with Marx, Engels, and Lenin, are heartily approved as the interpreters of Socialism.

In place of the private ownership of natural resources and machines, there is to be an integrated industry under a "Workers and Farmers Government." It will manage the whole of industry. Specifically, nationwide production goals will be set in accordance with the needs of the people, the work week will be shortened, vacations lengthened, an "ample living from cradle to grave" will be had, and "everyone can develop his talents to the fullest, to contribute his best to the world." The aim of the party is to become the mass party to build Socialism. To aid this purpose it is necessary to foster the class consciouness of the workers. Socialism is the inevitable end-product of the evolution of Capitalism.

From the global point of view, the party declares:

> When the United States goes socialist, a number of other countries will follow suit, eventually all of them. A new powerful means of expanding production then comes into play. The industrial system of the entire world will be united into an efficient, streamlined, smooth, functioning, interlocking whole, run according to scientific plan.

The Socialist Workers Party continues:

> The emphasis upon the long-range view and the great emancipating goal of Socialism lifts you out of the stifling, dreary circle of existence imposed by Capitalism on working people. You become part of the *vanguard* whose lives are tied in with the magnificent future that lies before humanity.

The World Socialist Party of the U. S. Its headquarters is in Boston, Massachusetts, with branches in several cities. Started in 1916, it is "an entirely independent organization, not affiliated with any other organization in the United States. Its only associations are with similar Socialist Parties in Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland which share its principles." The bimonthly, *Western Socialist,* a "journal of scientific socialism in the Western Hemisphere," is published by both the World Socialist Party of the U. S. and the Socialist Party of Canada.

The main objective, as announced by the World Socialist Party of the U. S., is "the establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of society as a whole." The present political state, with its coercive force and governmental machine, will no longer exist under Socialism.

In its global outlook the party says:

> Socialism is necessarily an international conception. It is impossible for Socialism to exist in one country while the rest of the world remains based on capitalist competition and profit seeking. At the same time, the establishment of Socialism throughout the world will mean the elimination of the capitalist struggles for markets, and therefore will eliminate the chief cause of war.

The method proposed for achieving Socialism is that the majority of the working class organize into a party to obtain control of the powers of the state by

the democratic means of the vote. The party is opposed to "a conscious minority vanguard," instead of the majority of the workers, bringing about the socialist society. It is also against direct action, meaning a general strike or violence or an armed uprising.

The party is against Capitalism because it involves production solely for profit as well as depressions and wars. It does not oppose the efforts of workers to obtain reforms, such as better housing, and supports their organizing into unions; but nevertheless as a party it desires to concentrate wholly on the main task of "abolishing Capitalism and introducing Socialism."

As to Russia, the party maintains that it is not a socialist society but State Capitalism. The state is merely substituted for individual Capitalists. The status of the workers is still that of being simply wage-earners. Leninism, Trotskyism, and Stalinism are also opposed, for they do not represent true Marxism to which the World Socialist Party of the U. S. says it adheres.

Now let us turn to three non-party groups or leagues.

The Communist League. This league, which publishes the monthly journal, *Turning Point,* in New York City, announces its aim to be for peace, democracy, and Socialism, and for working "towards a New Marxist-Leninist Communist Party." The league strongly attacks the Communist Party, U. S. A., maintaining for various reasons that it is totally inadequate to lead the United States to Socialism. The league also opposes what it calls "American Trotskyism." In its global outlook, it declares that "Communism is winning out on this planet."

The Independent Socialist League. This New York City group declares that it favors the bringing about of the common ownership of the means of production and distribution by peaceful, constitutional means. It opposes the Communist Party, U. S. A., Trotskyism, Stalinism, Russian Communism, and totalitarianism.

Union for Democratic Socialism. Founded as recently as 1953 in New York City, the union is not a political party but an educational movement for what it calls "democratic Socialism." It asserts that "it shall not be controlled by nor seek to control any political party." A number of its members also belong to the Socialist Party, U. S. A.; the union says it is not a rival of the latter. A monthly *Newsletter* and pamphlets are issued by the union.

Opposing both Communism and Fascism, the union desires to reexamine and restate the ideas of democratic Socialism for our time, to bring together democratic Socialists regardless of party or group affiliations, to cooperate with liberal and labor movements, and to defend Socialism from misrepresentation or ignorant misunderstanding.

Its program includes favoring a high degree of economic and social planning; recognizing different forms of ownership whether public, cooperative, or private; and having natural resources made the property of the people. On a world scale, it approves collective security, universal disarmament, and global cooperation against poverty.

Four journals not connected with any political party are listed and commented upon below.

The American Socialist. A comparatively recent magazine, published monthly in New York City. Its articles deal with politics and labor in the United States, with foreign affairs, and with recent books.

Dissent. This journal, published in New York City and initiated in 1953, is called "a quarterly journal of socialist opinion." Its statement of purpose says that it is not and does not propose to become a political party or group. Its declared aim is to be "radical" and in the "tradition of democratic Socialism." It is opposed, on the one hand, to the *status quo* in the United States, and, on the other hand, to totalitarianism, whether Fascist, Stalinist, or any other form.

Monthly Review. Founded in New York City in 1949, the review asserts that it is an independent socialist magazine, free of partisan or political control. Besides the magazine, its press publishes pamphlets and books.

Socialism is defined as follows: "We mean by Socialism a system of society with two fundamental characteristics: first, public ownership of the decisive sectors of the economy; and second, comprehensive planning of production for the benefit of the producers themselves."

With reference to Russia, the review maintains that it is socialist, but is not above criticism simply because it is socialist. The main concern of the review is stated to be that of bringing Socialism about in the United States rather than abroad. But it adds: "We are convinced that the sooner the United States is transformed from a capitalist to a socialist society, the better it will be not only for Americans but for all mankind."

The New Leader. This weekly journal has been in existence for more than thirty years, and is published by the American Labor Conference on International Affairs, Inc., New York City. The journal is against Communism, Fascism, and Capitalism, and is for "democratic Socialism."

In attempting to sum up the principles and programs of the foregoing political parties, leagues, and journals, it is of interest to note their similarities and especially their differences.

All of them obviously oppose Capitalism and desire the establishment of Socialism. All are for a large degree at least of planning under Socialism. All, it likewise seems, are against the present Federal Government of the United States, as now constituted, without any changing, owning, and operating basic resources and industries. One reason is that the employer-employe relationship similar to individual Capitalism would remain; another reason is that a new set-up of a democratic-socialistic type of administration is desired. Also most, but not quite all, favor the Marxist brand of Socialism.

Differences, however, exist. The majority do not believe that Russia represents true Socialism; a minority think that it does. Further, some favor Stalinism, others Trotskyism, and many oppose both. Making reforms now within Capitalism, before achieving the ultimate goal of Socialism, is advocated by some and opposed by others. At least two give a rather detailed blueprint of a new socialist society, as well as general principles.

Thus Socialists in the United States agree in opposing Capitalism and establishing Socialism, but disagree on various points of more or less importance.

AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION
REGIONAL CONFERENCE

Marott Hotel, Indianapolis, Saturday, October 27. Symposia on "Population and Birth Control," "The Transactional Approach to Human Understanding." Herman J. Muller on "Science for Humanity." Write for program: Box 227, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

Marital Vows

GEORGE E. O'DELL

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, though some years apart, there appeared two notable (or notorious) novels which socially correct persons considered unsuitable for young people's reading—they dealt freely with the subject of marriage, and they might have deleterious effects, might even cause a revolt against marriage as involving vows of lifelong fidelity.

But how? Certainly Olive Schreiner had early become an ardent feminist, denounced masculine assumptions of superiority, advocated "emancipation" for women, and depicted in *The Story of an African Farm* two persons agreeing to live together unmarried so as not to make their life unbearable if either should tire of it. Let them part! But in the end the man goes—and poor Lyndall turns her face to the wall and dies.

Then there was *The Woman Who Did*. Grant Allen, eminent in science but needing to write popular novels to ensure a sufficient living, declared this story to be the only one he had composed wholly to please himself. Here also marriage was freely discussed. Because of a romantic wish to leave each other free, hero and heroine make no unbreakable promises yet are mutually loyal as though husband and wife, their unconsecrated attachment being unknown as such to their friends. But in time a beloved daughter grows up and becomes engaged. The parents, being obviously honest people, feel they must tell the girl, who will doubtless tell the man, of her illegitimacy. Let them know of it now, not discover it later. Then the daughter, informed, turns on her father and mother and, so to speak, rends them limb from limb.

Perhaps it now sounds old-fashioned? But, for myself, secretly reading both books by candlelight in bed, the effect was not any denigration of marriage but rather a confirmed conviction of the social and psychological worth of the institution, of the need for intended lifelong loyalty, and the duty to accept the ethics of one's day even though hoping for one or another change towards better, more humane, ways.

In particular, one shrank from countenancing what may be described as "moral wilfulness," however sincere. Writing as above has brought painfully to my mind the first of a great many funerals at which it has been my lot to officiate. It must have been nearly fifty years ago. Like the couples in the stories, a young man and woman decided on an unregistered "marriage." There was a fine nobility about both. But the woman was a Lyndall, a rebel on women's behalf; a self-sacrificing "suffragette," passionately devoted to helping gain for women equality of respect with men. Childbirth arrived. The midwife insisted, in a crisis, she must summon a doctor. A woman doctor? Yes. But none was available. The prospective mother flatly refused to be operated on by a man. And so she died. The agony of the "husband" at his partner's grave remains one of my most vivid tragic memories.

No, a world of anarchical sentimentalists would be unbearable to live in. Ought this or that hoary custom or law be changed? Then fight for change, but let it be done by the democratic method of discussion, education, agitation, new laws, not by setting oneself apart from the common lot, thereby probably causing misery to this one or that of one's fellow beings. We are interrelated and responsible for one another's good.

Whatever we may individually think of the recent Royal Commission report on marriage—too conventional to satisfy some, too lax to please others—at least we can surely approve of its emphasis on responsibility, and its demand for more and better education for it. That intolerable hardships should be escapable in even greater measure than now, that lives should not be cruelly ruined by marital failure may indeed be a right way to see the problem but the problem itself could be vastly lessened if young people grew up used to the duty of considering others' good, even the good of one other, even more than each one's selfish own.

Many a husband is likely in the course of his married years to ask himself (some sad day) what he is getting out of the companionship—rather than what he is contributing to it, of understanding, sympathy, pity, forgiveness. But has he been, or tried to be, such a contributor, what does he *not* get out of it, in maturing character, in spiritual growth, in the happiness that can come unasked through concentration on another, however weak or inadequate in some respects, more than on oneself?

Besides, success in marriage does not necessarily depend on lasting "love" in the passionate or romantic sense. Persons may reach a silver or golden wedding having all along had only a nominal mutual affection, and yet be aware that responsibility for each other has made their living together worthwhile. Would they in the end have been more content if married to others than themselves? Nor, despite the emphasis placed by royal commissions, divorce court judges, and certain preachers on parents putting children's good first, should it be thought that offspring are essentially the more important. Not at all. Every living person (conventionally "in the sight of God") is of inherent worth and to be judged by his own idealism and conduct.

These are principles. And let it not be cynically urged that young people cannot be educated in great measure for responsibility in marriage—that they *will* go their own way. This is to forget the force of custom and tradition in shaping even marital ideas. It does not occur to brothers and sisters to "fall in love" or to think of marriage within any of the prohibited relations; almost all Hindus (a high-class people) marry within their caste; in class-conscious countries social status almost wholly governs choice for courtship. These are commonplaces of sociology mentioned here only to illustrate how tradition and education count, even where urgent feelings are concerned.

In this mere thousand words or so, other aspects of marriage—such, for instance, as right canons for separation and divorce—cannot be touched upon. It must suffice to express approval of the Commission's plea for promoting seriousness in entering marriage as much as in breaking it, and for education, even in schools, such as may help predispose acceptance of such mental attitudes as may substantially reduce the chances of disaster.

Is Marriage a Refuge for Women?

ETHEL S. BEER

My Grandmother—a true matriarch—who died in her nineties, used to say:

"I want to live until all my grandchildren are married."

"But Granny," I invariably remonstrated, "what you really want is to see them happy."

"I guess so," she would admit somewhat skeptically. To her the two were more or less synonomous, particularly for her granddaughters. Grandmother was convinced that marriage was the only career for women. Yet she had been very active as a widow, and was devoted to her sister—a maiden lady—who was a doctor.

Times have changed since Grandmother formulated her ideas in the last century. A great deal has happened in this world since her death in 1935. But the attitude toward marriage is not so different. In spite of the facts, marriage is still considered a refuge for women.

To be sure, in the past, marriage usually offered women relief from gainful employment. However, today more and more married women are working either from preference or actual need. And some keep it up indefinitely. Whether this financial independence affects the permanence of marriage, it is hard to tell. Certainly the greater frequency of divorce shows that marriages are less likely to last now than in the past. This may be, because so many women conceive of marriage as an escape from their narrow unattached existence. Yet there is no reason why a woman alone cannot lead a full life. In fact, this is an excellent preparation for marriage if it comes. The point is that marriage is not a refuge, as foolish women think, but a partnership of intense personal value, especially when there are children.

The tragedy is that, in spite of the emancipation of women, too often marriage still is believed to be a cure-all for their troubles.

"Where can I meet men?" asks Leah, a young business girl, running her red-tipped fingers through her permanently waved short brown hair. Neither her position in the office of a bakery nor her home in a housing project leads to contacts with the opposite sex, eligible for marriage from her standpoint. And she feels that life is empty without a husband.

Vivacious Lillian, from an entirely different set, expresses the same view. With a smile on her carefully made-up lips, which does not belie her seriousness, she states:

"I want to get married, period."

Because of this desire she never seems to settle down but flits from one interest to another. This in turn may have influenced her relationship with men, whom she has no difficulty in knowing socially. At any rate the thirties are slipping by, and Lillian is single so far.

Of course, some women marry when they are older than Lillian. Weddings of couples living in old folks' homes are reported now and then. An intimate friend of mine—a busy professional woman—made a romantic match at fifty-three. She met her husband on a trip and now is a happy wife, stepmother, and step-grandmother in her sixties. Behind her lies a successful career. Neverthless she always hoped for marriage, regarding it as the ultimate goal for women.

Mothers often encourage this attitude, whether or not they have been happy themselves. They are ashamed of a single girl approaching thirty, and seriously alarmed if she passes that mark.

"What can I do about Anna?" asks grey-haired Mrs. Segreto, whose troubles have aged her prematurely. "She always has her nose in a book. How does she expect to catch a man?" Yet Anna, just twenty-five, lives in a home of strife, where the mother has to work to supplement her husband's earnings, most of which he drinks away. Is it any wonder, then, that Anna strives to improve her lot by studying?

A daughter's divorce—even two—does not quench the hopes of some mothers. Implicitly they believe that another marriage will do the trick and do not hestitate to hint broadly to that effect.

"When you marry I'll go to live with your sister in the country," says Mrs. Hirsh to Myra, the only daughter of her four at home. The others are married and have children. So Myra, youthful looking in her middle thirties, is her mother's concern. And although she was divorced twice in her twenties, Mrs. Hirsh cannot visualize Myra's future without a husband. Yet she earns a good salary and has enough resources within herself to have wide interests.

Pathetically, too, mothers struggling to bring up their children alone turn to a second husband as a savior. Even when the father fails in his duty, this does not sour them for another mate.

"My luck has changed at last, I'm going to be married," announces Mrs. Brandt gleefully. By the tone of her voice she might be a young girl engaged for the first time. Actually she is in her early thirties and has three boys, whom for years she has been supporting practically unaided. Her first husband proved so unreliable that they were divorced. Now she contemplates marrying a bachelor of her own age, confident that he will be a devoted husband and a real father to her boys.

Widows have a tendency to glamorize marriage, conveniently forgetting the shortcomings of their own.

"If only Dan were here, he'd understand," says Mrs. Hart, a well-preserved widow in her sixties. Her children are married and live away. And she finds it hard to make new friends. Actually this latter is due to her state of mind, as she is an intellectual person who would be welcome in many groups. The truth is that her troubles go back to the past. She did not have an all-absorbing family life. Nor did she move in a congenial set. Therefore, she is lonely and colors her marriage in retrospect.

Marriage still is surrounded by a halo no matter how tarnished. With all of woman's vaunted independence, inconsistently she regards it as a refuge. Yet it may not change her daily existence materially and certainly does not always permanently.

Recent statistics show that more married women are working than single women. The preponderance of these are living with their husbands. In rural districts, married women workers living with their husbands outnumbered single women workers two to one. Seven million couples in the United States had both husband and wife working; 25 per cent of all households had

two workers. Doubtless with the mobilization of industry going on at present, more and more wives will be drawn into the labor market. At any rate, the fact that married women hold jobs is accepted far more generally today than formerly. And the practice often is hotly defended by them.

"Of course, I expect to work after I'm married, at least for awhile," emphatically asserts twenty-two year old Rita, tossing her pretty red head defiantly. "After all we can't wait until Jack earns enough. So what else is there to do?" The two have positions in the same office, and expect to remain there.

Jane has never stopped working, although she has been married for a number of years. She met her husband by chance at a dinner given by a friend, after the first blush of youth was passed. Already her face was assuming that austere look, attributed to "old maids." By her own efforts she had won an important position in her office. But she was not entirely satisfied, perhaps unconsciously feeling that something was wrong with her because she was still single. Probably, too, she resented her younger sisters being married. Yet on the surface she was resigned. However, in spite of her craving for marriage beforehand, she has never quit business to become a mere housewife. So far no children have complicated the situation. Nor does it seem likely that they will at this late date, which is just as well.

Not that children deter mothers from working, particularly after they reach school age. To be sure, some have little choice. Failure of marriage ending in separation or divorce, the death of a husband, or his inadequate earnings, all swell woman's labor market. Other mothers work because they prefer a profession or business to remaining at home.

Irene—approaching forty now—still has a lovely face, although she is heavier than she was as a girl. At the very mention of teaching—her chosen profession —she beams.

"I just love teaching," she says, "that's why I stick at it. The amount I make doesn't count. Most of it goes to pay a maid to look after the household. And I need more clothes than if I stayed at home."

Irene has two children, a girl of preschool age and a boy in his teens. Also, her husband earns enough without her salary. Only they could not afford a maid.

On the other hand, blond Mrs. Monet, aged twenty-five, has no profession to lure her. Before her marriage she worked in an office and has ever since with few intermissions, although there is no need as her husband is well-paid. But even her two-year-old son does not stop her. She just turns him over to somebody else and continues to pound a typewriter.

"I'm a much better mother for it, too," she claims in self-defense." "I never was made to be a housewife and to take care of children."

She is not alone in this attitude. Many women consider housework boring, including looking after children. Granted that they have some justification for their feelings, is not business monotonous at times, too? Even the professions have their dull moments. Besides, how about the nightmare of crowded transportation in big cities? Do not these counterbalance the tediousness of household chores and the unesthetic details of child rearing? While a pay check may be welcome, can it really compensate a mother for missing intimate association with her children? It is bad enough when she has to because of financial circumstances.

"But marriage brings companionship," claimed Mrs. Stone. "Now I do not have to look forward to an old age alone, as I was so afraid I would have to." A slight birthmark on her face had made her self-conscious when she was younger. But after this was treated so that it practically disappeared, she gained poise and eventually married. Today, with a husband and daughter, she is certain that marriage prevents loneliness.

Needless to say such a generalization does not hold water. Apart from the high divorce rate many couples drift apart spiritually, although they may remain together legally. To be sure, second and third marriages do succeed sometimes after others have failed. But this only proves that marriage is no guaranty of life-long companionship. Nor do children always grow up congenial with their mothers. Some are definitely estranged.

Handsome Mrs. Singer was married to a man considerably older than she was. It was her second trial and his third. Nevertheless all went well at first. They had a daughter, whom both adored. Inexplicably, though, this girl turned more and more to her father as she grew older, until the mother felt so left out that she departed. Now the father and daughter live together, while Mrs. Singer is a business woman, just like she was before her marriage.

Perhaps happy wives are more ready to admit that marriage is not a refuge for women.

"Our marriage vows state that we take each other for better and for worse. But too often the better is taken for granted and the worse is not expected at all. Yet it happens in every marriage," aptly asserts Mrs. Brown, who seems quite satisfied to be a wife and mother, although she relinquished a career.

One difficulty is that too many people look on the lives of women without husbands as barren, forgetting that this depends on them. The problem is to find interests and develop one's inner resources. An enjoyable job helps, particularly when it leads to pleasant contacts. Work is a solace even when it is not paid for. Nor are the professions the only stimulating occupations. Endless opportunities challenge the working women of this modern era.

Bright-eyed Marylynn decided that she wished to try something besides commercial designing for which she had been trained. So she shifted to a position in an office handling details of radio broadcasting and is delighted in spite of the decided cut in salary.

"Money is not everything," says she.

Naturally not all women can afford to change their line of work. Or they may lack courage to do so. Then they must compensate on the outside and accept earning a living as a routine. Obvious attractions, such as movies, theatres, concerts, sports, and so forth, are always available in large places and increasingly so in small ones today. The advantage is that often these can be enjoyed alone. Dancing, dining out, participating in athletics of all kinds, are traditional ways to fill leisure time. Education is stimulated by various means. Various courses exist for the intellectual. Radio, television, books, and magazines supplement schooling for adults. Museums and libraries spread culture to the public. Both light and serious pursuits can be fun. The unattached woman, young or old, does not have to be frivolous to have a good time.

Interest in others is a satisfying experience. Human nature is ever absorbing. Children always abound and

few women can resist their charms, if they take the trouble to become acquainted. Friendship with all ages, of both sexes, and with people from different backgrounds, is broadening. Our comrades need not be only our contemporaries, nor confined to the circle in which we grew up. Travel offers endless possibilities for contacts, besides being an eye opener. Nor need it be banned by a modest pocketbook. Many working girls spend enough on vacations at resorts to cover a great deal of ground. Even the amount of time essential for long trips can be solved if they are allowed to accumulate their vacations from year to year. Besides, positions in foreign lands exist for those qualified. The world is full of adventure for those who seek it, including the prosaic happenings of every day as well as the glamorous actions. The spirit counts most in the end.

Marriage, then, is not a refuge for women. They must have the power within themselves to create a worthwhile existence. In other words, marriage should not be entered into lightly by either mate because too much is at stake. Rightly conceived, marriage is a deep-seated union between a man and a woman, affording each infinite satisfaction, and is meant to be the basis of the greatest treasure human beings have: a rich family life.

Lincoln Looks Away

HAROLD P. MARLEY

The well-known Alexander Hesler photograph of Lincoln hangs just over the judge's bench in the courtroom where the major political scandal of this generation is being listened to by the attentive ears of a grand jury. It is the same room which Lincoln frequented in the days before he made his epochal departure to assume the Presidency. In those days it was one of the chambers in the State Capitol building, and in all the rough-and-tumble of those pioneer days there was never such a hodgepodge in high places of government.

The face of Lincoln in this enlarged photograph is turned aside. He does not face the jury box or the witness stand. He seems to be fixating on some far corner of the room, unable to witness the sad display of perfidy. If he hears what the prosecutor is saying, he shows no recognition. Like of old, he is in that mood so often noticed by his colleagues, a deep dejection which absorbed him at times in the middle of the proceedings of a court session.

Lincoln looks the other way! Lincoln, the man of impeccable honesty, the neighborly man of the little town of Springfield who was friend to the common man. He does not seem impressed by the great new Capitol building a quarter-mile distant where busloads of school children come from distant counties to stare at the silver dome surmounting the multi-million dollar structure. A bronze statue of the martyred President stands outside, his back to the air-conditioned auditor's office in the corner, and into which no one can look. River man that he was, it is curious that Lincoln has no ejaculation of awe at the dam which impounds a lake of clean water ten miles back—a lake made unclean by the hideout mansion of the man on trial, and the watery grave chosen by one of the guilty who had no hideout, not even in his own conscience.

As one studies the face of Lincoln beside the flag, now with forty-eight stars, which he held together in one piece, one wonders! There is the rumpled hair, as from a frolic with his boys whom he affectionately called "rascals." The familiar mole on the cheek is there, like a fresh teardrop from those brooding eyes. One considers the many changes in the State he once stumped, on roads where his buggy wheels bogged down in the mud of the rich prairie soil. And the question always arises, what of the people? The people who combine their grain and who speed along the new four-lane highways? The people who have been defrauded and who fail to blush when one of the indicted carelessly tossed off the comment: "To steal from the State is what is expected."

Lincoln may well look away, but let not the people of whom Carl Sandburg sung neglect the lesson of this tragic melodrama. Let them not ask for whom the bell tolls next,—"it tolls for them."

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 34)

the housing constructed will be segregated. Negro families who have been moved out in the relocation process are either not being provided with housing—causing crammed living accommodations and re-institution of slums—, or because of excessive rents or outright discriminatory rental policies cannot move into Title I projects."

Despite discrimination in the urban renewal program, the ACLU continued, the Race Relations Service which could provide an effective race relations review of Title I projects does not function in the Urban Renewal Administration.

The Federal Housing Administration, which provides mortgage insurance for private dwellings, also follows discriminatory policies, the ACLU charged. Since 1946 only 2% of the new homes insured by FHA have been available to minorities, "and the vast number of these are all-Negro developments in the South."

While FHA states that occupancy patterns are not their business and tries to encourage private builders to provide more housing for minority groups, the ACLU said, "we submit that the FHA's mortgage insurance program is the dispensing of government benefits. If the government's policy is to eliminate discrimination in housing, such benefits should not be given unless a non-discrimination pledge is obtained. . . . By sanctioning mortgage aid to builders who follow discriminatory housing practices, FHA is fostering the creation of all-white suburbs."

—*ACLU Bulletin*

What Faith Should Mean to You

EDWARD PODOLSKY

Faith is the greatest anchor to reality in modern life today. Students of mental and emotional health have found that no person can be well-adjusted, efficiently integrated, emotionally and mentally, without faith.

Faith means a great many things; to some it means an all-abiding belief in a Supreme Being, an adherence to religious teachings, an unflinching trust in humanity, a steadfast trust in one's country and in one's self. To others faith means a belief in something which cannot be proved in a rigorous and scientific manner, and hence has to be dismissed as of no value as a human experience. Today many psychiatrists are of the firm opinion that faith is a very essential part of our day-to-day experiences and a quite necessary element in effective, creative human living.

Faith is an indication of a very important phase of the human personality. A person attempting to live without faith is a person who is submerged in an all-pervading sense of fear and hopelessness. He is constantly being subjected to doubts and anxieties. He has left himself without defenses against all sorts of doctrines and teachings of a dubious or spurious nature.

There are two kinds of faith: rational faith and irrational faith. Irrational faith is a firm, unshakable belief in an idea, an institution, a person, a doctrine, or a practice, arrived at without doing any thinking about it, or without experiencing any true inner convictions. This kind of faith is not based on one's own experience with this idea or practice or person. There has been no deep contemplation on this matter. Irrational faith is based on the command of a stronger personality to believe. This authority may be right or it may be wrong, but if faith is given without thinking matters through to one's inner conviction and emotional satisfaction, this faith is not built on firm ground; it is irrational and useless because it serves no inner personal needs.

Faith based on fear and power is an invasion of one's most prized possession, the human mind and spirit. Irrational faith is one method of thought control. You believe in something because you are commanded to do so, and not because you have found out the reason for this faith yourself. Irrational faith based on the selfish command to believe is a fertile source of inner doubts, conflicts, and tensions.

Authority may be rational or irrational. Rational authority is based on democratic principles, while irrational authority is based on fascistic concepts. In a democracy a person forms his own opinion, faith, and belief. He is free and unfettered to do so. In an authoritarian community there is the command to believe and to have unquestioning faith in what the all-powerful leader wants the individual to have faith in. The free man who can and does form his own basis for faith is an emotionally healthier and happier one than the person who has his faith formed for him by others.

Another characteristic of irrational faith is a firmly established conviction about a person or a thing which has its foundation in the blinded submission to irrational authority—a submission made at the expense of self-respect and spiritual degradation. On the other hand, rational faith is not based on blind submission to authority, but arises from inner conviction, based on sound thought, and is emotionally satisfying. Irrational faith is based on inaction and submission. Rational faith is based on freedom of action and the free exercise of the will.

True faith is always based on conviction. Conviction can be based on thinking matters out for one's self, and it can also be based on rational emotional experience. Faith based on mental processes is arrived at actively by the person who mentally explores things for himself. He has thought out his belief and he has based it on certainty, a certainty and inner conviction which he has found in the basis of his mental processes.

Now, faith based on thought processes may be individual, or it may be general. It is general when many people have arrived at the same faith by the same or similar processes. Thus, faith in God, faith in democracy, faith in one's country, faith in one's fellow men, and in one's self, is faith arrived at by inner convictions; it is true and rational faith.

Thought, however, is not the only basis for rational belief. One may have faith in a person or a thing because of the reliability and changelessness of the person or thing. Constancy and reliability are good grounds on which faith can be built.

There is also another factor on which faith is founded. There is a faith based on experience that a certain event will take place, that a certain person will do a certain thing because there are inherent potentialities present to bring about this realization. Not only are these potentialities present, but there is also the certainty that they will most certainly be realized.

Faith is also based on seeing the good points in others. This is generalized faith in man. Faith in man is also based on his potentialities, inner resources, innate goodness, rationality, and ever-present sense of humanity. Faith in man is based on the conclusion that there is more good than bad in him.

Faith in one's own self is based on the unshakable inner conviction of one's own integrity, potentialities, and social and personal usefulness. It is a truism that the person who has faith in himself generally has faith in others.

Faith in others is based on a feeling that one is equal to others and not inferior or superior to them, is independent and related to all by human bonds, and not because some one has authority. A person is capable of experiencing affection for others, not because he is commanded to do so but because affection is the basis of equality and respect for one's fellow men.

Faith in God is a great faith as well as a necessary one. A man with faith and love for God attains a satisfactory emotional outlet for dependence on a higher source than himself, a source for satisfaction of certain essential spiritual and emotional needs.

The idea of faith in God is wholly a natural one with all mankind. Religious belief comes into existence as a response on the part of men living together in the milieu of a common physical environment. The religious reaction is a development out of a natural response to a natural stimulus, not a mystical response to a supernatural stimulus. Religious faith appeals to

the emotions. It is a means of tapping reservoirs of energy. As such it can serve as a powerful impetus toward resolving emotional tensions, doubts, and conflicts.

We can have no doubt that faith is a very essential experience in everyone's personal life. There are times when an unshakable faith is necessary to regain health and bodily well-being. Physicians have always known that in any illness the chances of recovering for the patient who has faith in his recuperative powers are much greater than those who have faith only in themselves. Doctors, in examining 1,600 patients who were hospitalized for eight organic diseases, found that fully 80 per cent had some mental or emotional factor contributing to the disease, the most prominent being lack of faith in the ability to shake off the disease. Those who recovered most readily were those who had faith in their recuperative powers.

Now we arrive at a conception of the place of faith in life. To continue as an effective social human being we need faith. To keep our minds sane and our emotions healthy in a world of tensions and conflicts requires faith. We must have faith in whatever we believe in, in our country, in our ideas and ideals, in others, and in ourselves.

The Study Table

The Dead Sea Scrolls

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE ORIGINALITY OF CHRIST. *By Geoffrey Graystone. New York: Sheed and Ward. 117 pp. $2.50.*

It is now nine years since some Bedouin boys discovered some ancient Hebrew manuscripts in a cave in the Desert of Judea. These ancient manuscripts belonged to the Essene Order which had a settlement near the Dead Sea. The Tell which marks the place of the Essene buildings is known to the Arabs as Khirbet (Arabic for ruin) Qumran. The Essenes, a notable Jewish sect of the time of Christ, have been described by three writers of the first century A.D.: Pliny, Josephus, and Philo. Pliny located them exactly where the building and library were found. Pliny was a Roman. Philo and Josephus were Jews and naturally tell more about the Essenes. This remarkable discovery has inspired all scholars to write about them in all languages. To date some seven hundred books and pamphlets have been written in all languages about the scrolls. Father Graystone has written this book from the Roman Catholic standpoint. The problem as he sees it is this: Do the Scrolls take away the originality of Jesus? This is the evidence to date: the order of Essenes resembled that of the early Christians. Both held the doctrine of brotherhood as did the Roman Stoics. Both used ritual washing or baptism. Both held to communism, cf. Acts 2:44f. Now the question is this: Did the Jewish New Covenant prepare the way for the Christian New Covenant? The last part of the book attempts to answer Edmund Wilson's book. Graystone points out that Wilson is not a Biblical scholar. But Wilson insists that no one but a secular scholar is able to grapple with the problems of the Dead Sea Scrolls. He holds that Biblical scholars are prejudiced. Wilson also points out that there has always been a theory that Jesus was originally an Essene. This Graystone denies.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Superlative

HYMNS AND HUMAN LIFE. *By Erik Routley. New York: Philosophical Library. 346 pp. $6.00.*

This excellent discussion considers first the historical and ideational context out of which the greatest hymns used in England have emerged: the first centuries, the Middle Ages, the Reformers and religious wars, the Puritans, the eighteenth century evangelicals, and then what is called "Wrath and Praise." The second section considers the authors: the clergy, men of letters, and other distinguished "visitors," women, Americans, and youth.

The book throbs with life far more than any other of its kind that I have ever read. From the standpoint of giving a "feel," it is superlative. Its usefulness for American readers is somewhat impaired by its almost exclusive concern with England. The omission of "America the Beautiful" and "O Master Let Me Walk with Thee" indicates a somewhat startling lack of awareness of the situation on this side of the water. Yet as a general discussion, it is still by far the best which has yet appeared.

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

The Eternal Schism

THE PROTESTANT TRADITION. *By J. S. Whale. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press. 302 pp. $3.75.*

This is one of the most important books to appear since the beginning of the modern ecumenical movement. Studies of Luther and Calvin make up the first part of this book. In his discussion of both Luther and Calvin, Dr. Whale deals with the primary sources which he knows thoroughly. His discussion of Calvin's theory of predestination is one of the most interesting passages in the book. It must be read to be thoroughly appreciated. The second part of this book deals with the ecumenical movement. Above all, the section which deals with the Roman Catholic Church and toleration must be read by all thinking persons. Whale deals with it in a straightforward way. Concerning the ecumenical movement, Dr. Whale sums up the whole matter in unforgettable words by showing that there has never been at any time in history a united church. Schism has not been the monopoly of a few sects.

> From the moment when Paul withstood Peter to the face (Gal. 2:11) the ugly possibility of schism showed itself, and it soon became a reality at Corinth and elsewhere. The word translated as "divisions" in I Cor. 1:10 is schisms. The word is plural because there were four. . . . The seamless robe early became a coat of many colors.

Everyone who is even remotely interested in religion should read and ponder this book.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

FRUIT BASKET UPSET

The past few months have seen many changes in Unitarian leadership in the Western Conference. The next few months will see more. It is as though the fruit basket had been upset and everybody is on the move. Among those involved are James Luther Adams, John W. Cyrus, John Fordon, Erwin Gaede, Rudolph Gilbert, Randall Hilton, Tom Maloney, Charles Phillips, Curtis Reese, and Wallace Robbins.

Here is what has been, and is, happening. James Luther Adams is leaving Meadville Theological School to go to the Divinity School of Harvard University on January 1, 1957; John Cyrus left Omaha to become minister at Milwaukee; John Fordon is doing public relations for a St. Louis hospital; Erwin Gaede is leaving South Bend to become minister of the new church in Westwood, California; Rudolph Gilbert has left Denver and is the Leader of the Chicago Ethical Society; Randall Hilton will become the Dean of Abraham Lincoln Centre and Editor of UNITY, beginning February 15, 1957; Tom Maloney left Quincy, Illinois, to join the personnel department of Westinghouse in Pittsburgh; Charles Phillips left Des Moines to become minister at Omaha; Curtis Reese is retiring as Dean of Abraham Lincoln Centre and will live in Florida, spending summers at his farm in Kentucky; and Wallace Robbins resigned as President of Meadville Theological School to become the minister at Worcester, Massachusetts.

Besides those mentioned above, the following churches have settled new ministers: Fort Wayne, Indiana, Hugo Leaming, formerly Assistant at Miami, Florida; Quincy, Illinois, John Morris, formerly Assistant at San Diego, California; Sioux City, Iowa, Carl H. Whittier, Jr., formerly minister of the Westminster Unitarian Church of Providence, Rhode Island; and North Shore, Lake Forest, Illinois, Russell Bletzer, formerly of Needham, Massachusetts.

There are still four vacant pulpits: Eliot Chapel, St. Louis, Missouri; Denver, Colorado; Des Moines, Iowa; and South Bend, Indiana.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE

Randall Hilton reported to the Executive Committee of the Conference in June his intention of leaving the post of Executive Secretary next February. The Executive Committee appointed the following as an Advisory Committee to bring recommendations to the Board for his successor: E. T. Buehrer, President of the Conference; Thaddeus B. Clark, Vice-President; Charles W. Phillips, Omaha; and Mrs. Christian Andreason, Springfield, Illinois.

AREA MEETINGS

North Central—Milwaukee, September 22.
Abraham Lincoln—Springfield, Illinois, October 5-6.
Rocky Mountain—Denver, October 6.
Ohio Valley—Cincinnati, October 18-19.
Iowa-Nebraska—Sioux City, October 18-20.
Minnesota—Minneapolis, October 26-27.
Michigan—Ann Arbor, November 2-3.
Chicago—First Church, December 8.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

United Unitarian Appeal

Ernst Wallau, Waukesha, Wisconsin, Conference Chairman.
Abraham Lincoln Area: Gerry Allard, Springfield, Illinois.
Chicago Area: Bernard Heinrich, Third Church, Chicago.
Iowa-Nebraska: Dan Williams, Des Moines, Iowa.
Michigan Area: Wray Smith, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Minnesota Area: Walter Chapin, St. Paul, Minnesota.
North Central Area: Oliver Trampe, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Ohio Valley Area: Durlin C. Hickok, Dayton, Ohio.
Rocky Mountain Area: Walter Pesman, Denver, Colorado.
U.U.A. Executive Director: O. T. Gilmore, Boston, Massachusetts.
Regional Director: Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, Illinois.

Religious Education

Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, Illinois, Chairman.
Mrs. Harry W. Adams, Kansas City, Missouri.
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Mrs. Vincent B. Silliman, Chicago, Illinois.
Mrs. Edward Blaurock, Detroit, Michigan.
Dr. Albert Eglash, La Crosse, Wisconsin.
Mr. James H. Percival, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Geneva Planning Council

Dr. James Bond, Toledo, Ohio, Chairman.
Mrs. Esther L. Heinrich, Chicago, Illinois, Secretary.
Mr. Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, Illinois, Treasurer.
Mrs. Harry Adams, Kansas City, Missouri.
Mrs. J. B. Allin, Chicago, Illinois.
Mr. Blythe Conn, Burlington, Iowa.
Mr. Charles W. Phillips, Omaha, Nebraska.
Mr. Edward H. Redman, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Mr. Ellsworth Smith, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Mrs. Cameron Williams, Indianapolis, Indiana.

The Committees on Fellowships, Program-Planning, Youth, and Nominations will be announced in the next issue.

FELLOWSHIPS

Who is responsible for Fellowships in the Unitarian organizational setup? As a result of discussions this summer between the Regional Directors and the Director of the Extension Department and the Fellowship Director, it was agreed that field trips for the purpose of organizing fellowships would be the responsibility of the Fellowship Director, Mr. Munroe Husbands; and that all orders for materials, brochures, pamphlets, and supplies should be sent to the Boston office. All other requests for assistance should be referred to the Regional Headquarters. In the case of the Western Unitarian Conference, that would be to the Chicago office.

It is hoped that in the Western Conference each of the sub-regional areas will appoint Committees on Fellowships which can be of aid to their Fellowships and the Regional Director, the Conference Secretary.

GENEVA

The 1956 Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly, the Geneva Conference, was a sellout. A total of 511 people registered during the week of June 24 to 30. This, plus the L.R.Y. Summer Conference held at the same place, College Camp, August 12 to 18, made for an all-time high of 599 persons attending all or a part of Western Conference-sponsored summer programs.

The program at the Family Conference in June was of exceptionally high quality and very well attended. The unique feature this year was the Religious Education Directors' Institute. Thanks should also be expressed to the Jackson Social Welfare Fund, Ann Arbor, Michigan, for providing the outstanding morning lecturer, Dr. Ralph Fuchs.

The High School L.R.Y. Conference in August was the first time the young people had met separately from the parent group. All reports from the young people indicated an excellent program and lots of fun. There was complete agreement that the young people should continue having their conference separately but that it should not be held at College Camp. The Youth Committee now has the responsibility of finding suitable camp facilities.

CONSTRUCTION

Ann Arbor, Michigan, has completed the building of the new church auditorium and the remodeled and enlarged parsonage.

Cincinnati, Ohio, First Church, has moved into its new education building. Dedication, October 7, 1956.

Des Moines, Iowa, the construction of the completely new church plant was temporarily halted by a local steel strike. Work is now progressing satisfactorily.

Toledo, Ohio, is adding a major building unit which will greatly expand its educational and program facilities.

GENEVA: FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT

Note Bene—The dates for the 1957 Summer Conference at College Camp, on Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, are June 30 to July 6, 1957.

The Geneva Planning Council is happy to announce that the morning lecturer for the 1957 Assembly will be Dr. James Bond of Toledo, Ohio. This will be the second in what is hoped might become a series of lectureships sponsored jointly by the Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly and the Jackson Social Welfare Fund.

Watch for further announcements on the outstanding program planned for Geneva next summer. A set of color slides of the 1956 Assembly is now available.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The Channing-Murray Foundation, the student group jointly sponsored by the Unitarian and Universalist churches of Urbana, Illinois, is augmenting its program this year and has added a Staff Associate. Arnold Westwood, minister of the Unitarian Church, and Earle McKinney, minister of the Universalist Church, are the Co-Directors. Miss Donna Miller is the Staff Associate. The office and meetings of the Foundation are in the Unitarian Church, located on the campus of the University at 1209 West Oregon Street, Urbana, Illinois.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Rev. Max Gaebler, minister of the Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin, tells the story, with picture, of the Channing-Murray House, the student center located on the campus of the University of Wisconsin in Madison, in the September issue of the *Christian Register* (p. 25).

DR. BROCK CHISHOLM

Dr. Brock Chisholm, Canadian psychiatrist and former Director General of the World Health Organization, will be speaking in several cities within the Western Unitarian Conference during October and November. He will appear at the First Unitarian Church of Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 30; at the Unitarian Church of Ann Arbor, Michigan, on November 16; and at the International House of the University of Chicago on November 18, 1956. These appearances are a part of a nation-wide lecture tour sponsored by the American Humanist Association. The general theme of Dr. Chisholm's lectures will be "The Psychological Foundations of Peace." Lewis A. McGee, Yellow Springs, Ohio, a member of the Board of the Western Unitarian Conference, is manager of the Humanist Speakers Bureau and is in charge of Dr. Chisholm's itinerary.

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

At a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Meadville Theological School, Dr. Sidney Mead was elected President. He succeeds Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, who resigned to become the minister of the Worcester, Massachusetts, Unitarian Church. Dr. Mead was professor of Church History in the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago and a member of the Faculty of the Meadville School. He is a member of the First Unitarian Society of Chicago and served on the faculty of the Geneva Summer Assembly last June.

TRAVELERS

Rev. Hurley Begun, Colorado Springs, spent the summer traveling in England and Western Europe.

Dr. Preston Bradley, People's Church, Chicago, was again this summer in Western Europe and England.

Rev. Waldemar Argow, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, went all the way around the world during his vacation.

EXTENSION

Unity Church of St. Paul has started a new Unitarian movement in Mahtomedi, a suburb of St. Paul. It is known as the White Bear Branch and it conducts both a church school and church service.

The First Unitarian Church and the Clifton Unitarian Church of Louisville, Kentucky, have established a joint committee for the purpose of starting a new Unitarian movement in Louisville.

HAPPY HEADACHES

The pressures of growth create problems of space and facilities. What some churches have done has already been noted. Here are a few more that have faced, or are facing, such pleasant problems.

Burlington, Iowa, has completed "finishing off" the second floor to provide more space for the church school.

Davenport, Iowa, has sold its building, purchased a lot, and is planning to build an entire new plant.

Cedar Rapids, Iowa, is so crowded that it is faced with the necessity of providing enlarged or new accommodations.

Kalamazoo, Michigan, polled its members by questionnaire to ascertain their wishes as to next steps. The preponderance of opinion looks toward the building of a new plant on a new location.